

March 31, 1977

LB 61, 238

SENATOR DWORAK: There is no way that this will fall back upon the city?

SENATOR FOWLER: I can't see how.

SENATOR DWORAK: Thank you, Senator Fowler.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President, members. I certainly subscribe to this way to improve districts in a city. Usually what happens is that 2/3 of the people in a downtown area say, want to do something and there is 1/3 that would like to be leaches and go along and get all the good out of it and put no money in. This is exactly, I think, what this is for. So, it is taxable and I see no way in the world how the city is going to lose any money because they can collect this just like they do the rest of the taxes. I think it's a good bill.

PRESIDENT: Senator Swigart, do you want to close debate?

SENATOR SWIGART: I'll be very brief, because I just want to say this. That is actually a new tool by which a community within a city may pick itself up and do things unique that will be attractive and to get trade and to add impetus to their neighborhood without it costing the city or the state a dime. They have to agree to pay the bill. They assess themselves. It does not go against the indebtedness of the city. I know that is one question that Senator Dworak asked. This is a new tool to do business and I would move that the bill be advanced.

PRESIDENT: The motion is to advance. Record your vote. Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 2 nays.

PRESIDENT: The bill is advanced. We go to LB 238.

CLERK: Read LB 238. The bill has been read on March 24. The committee amendments were adopted at that time and the bill was laid over.

PRESIDENT: Senator John Savage.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I hope that today I can resolve this situation a little better than I did last Thursday when Senator Simon, through a misunderstanding, thought that Senator Fowler was opposed to this bill. He went around & got three signatures and cut off my debate on the bill. Senator Dworak was concerned about it being another tax gimmick but the business areas of Omaha, especially Benson area where I live in south Omaha, because of lack of parking are concerned about keeping their parking open. The only opposition to this bill in the very beginning were from a parking lot operator who after being assured that the City of Omaha does not intend to get into the parking business and would lease any parking facilities out to a professional parking lot operator, they have removed their objection. The bill requires a 51% approval of adjoining property owners and issue of revenue bonds that are not payable from any